

New HQ at Langley

UNCLASSIFIED

L.K. White to ~~Mr.~~ Lansdale G. Sasscer, Jr. (I dont' know if this is the Cong. Sasscer; this letter is addressed to Md House of Delegates), Aug 4, 1955

we have considered over 30 possible locations  
one of our criteria: the necessity of being not more than 10 miles or 20 minutes driving time from White House and a little shorter time and distance if possible from Pentagon and State.  
another consideration: the accessibility of the site to bulk of our employees in light of heavy traffic during rush hrs.

from these standpts, "which enter into the efficiency of our organization, we came to the conclusion that of all of the sites considered the best would be the one on Government-owned land at Langley, Virginia, or, in the laternative, a site which could be purchased in the Alexandria area."

---

CONFIDENTIAL

CIA Congressional Relations, 2nd Session, 84th Congress, n.d., memo by Paul

DCI appeared before Mahon's Defense Subcomm of House Appro Comm in support of a request for [redacted], "the remainder of the full amount authorized for the CIA building and access roads."--hearing in executive session, but edited transcript later made public.

25X1

DCI also appeared before full Sen Appro Comm, in open session, to support this request.

both comms approved entire amount requested, but Sen comm report contained restrictive language, which provided that all CIA HQs personnel must be housed in a [redacted] building, and that Chairman of the NCPL must certify that local commitments have been obtained on ancillary facilities, including roads, deemed necessary by NCPC, before any funds can be obligated or spent on the project.

25X1

this language modified in conference report, which directs CIA to "make every effort" to accommodate all HQs personnel w/in a [redacted] building, and that no funds be spent "in such a way as to make it necessary for the Cong to authorize additional funds at a later date." The report further directs no funds be obligated or spent until DCI has obtained local commitments on ancillary facilities deemed necessary to serve the site.

25X1

Cong then approved the full [redacted] Bill enacted on 27 July 1956 as part of the First Supplemental Appropriation Bill (P.L. 814)

25X1

OVER

in his testimony befor both Appro Comms ~~xxx~~ and in separate confs w/ chairmen of ArmServ and Appro Comms, DCI had indicated the impossibility of constructing a suitable building for [ ] which would house the no. of employees for which space was originally estimated to be required.

25X1

He further indicated that he planned to raise w/ the Cong at next session the Q of an additional authorization and appropriation, presnetly estimed at [ ] to permit construction of an adequate building

25X1

## SECRET

16 Sept 1953 -- according to Col. White, DDCI favors the Langley site and DCI favors the 24th St. site. GSA has given its opinion that there will be no present building available which could properly house CIA

---

CONFIDENTIAL

~~Excluded from automatic downgrading and declassification~~

Kirkpatrick Memo for the Record, 4 Aug 1955

details re the need for speedy action to secure appropriations for new HQ

---

new HQ

worrk began on new HQ building at Langley on NOv 3, 1959

CONFIDENTIAL

Dulles Memorandum for Norman Paul, 14 Aug 1956

lunched w/ Dewey Short--talked re international probs, our request for pay hikes for senior officers, and the new HQ.

RE HQ, I told him of the prob we had had w/ Sen. Chavez, but that due to the support of Sens. Russell, Saltonstall, and others, I thought this difficulty had been removed for the time being.

---



8 Oct 51 - House Apprs. Comm. deletes funds  
requested for CIA construction purposes from 2nd Supplemental  
Appropriation Bill

[ try to find memo to DD/A, 23 Oct 51, re this ]

---

21 July 19 51--House ArmSerComm approved full project for construction of CIA HQs, contained in H.R. 4524. The matter was handled by Chairman Vinson w/out the apperaance of any CIA witness before the Comm.

15 Aug 1951--informed George Harvey, House Appro Comm, of the CIA construction appropiation in the Mil Construction bill. Harvey was disappointed re this item, as he felt that we had suffaicient authority to construct a building under our own statute and should have placed this item in the CIA budget, thus avoiding further conversations re CIA monies. He suggests further that whenever CIA matters are sent to the Hill, he be informed in advance so he can aid us in protecting cover.

29 Aug. 1951--DCI conferred w/ Sen. Russell, chairman of Senate ArmSer Comm, re new building. Russell said he would handle the matter personally w/ the Comm, and that he preferred that no CIA witness appear.

*5 Sept 51 - Senate passes Mil. Construction Act, including full authorization for new CIA HQs.*

---

find printed hearings by Senate Comm on Appropriations,  
84th Cong, 2nd sess, on The Supplemental Appropriation  
Bill of 1957

on p. 745, Stennis is telling Dulles: "we are going to  
have to draw a line somewhere and stop these figures at  
some pt."--in reference to new HQ, I think

---

in 1951, CIA got authorization for \$38 million. In 1955, it asked for considerably more. Why?

1. in 1955, had more employees, together w/ more realistic space requirements
  2. building costs went up 17% during that period
-

find speech by Repre. Brownson in Cong Rec. re mil.  
construction act of 1955--it begins:

"I do not know whether the CIA needs a \$6 million  
building site and a \$50 million building, or not. . . ."

---

SECRET

23 July 1955 -- Sen Appro Comm completed action on the appropriations for a CIA HQ installation. It authorized \$3 million for preparation of detail plans and specifications, \$4 million for extension of GW Memorial Pkwy should Agency locate at Langley, and \$350,000 for acquisition of land if we do not locate at Langley. The Comm. report (No. 1094) reads as follows:

"The comm. has approved \$3 million for planning and \$4 million for roads and purchase of site, including not to exceed \$350,000 for land purchase, if needed when final decision on the selection of the site is made. . . . There is much objection locally to the proposed Langley site. In addition, the traffic prob may be difficult. The comm believes that the proposed construction of the building should be commenced. . . ."

---

The Q of proper housing for CIA arose very soon after Nat Sec Act passed, for AGENCY personnel scattered thruout D.C., often in what had been designed to be only temporary buildings. With buildup in no. of Agency personnel following outbreak of fighting in June 1950, new impetus given to this matter. The security hazares involved in transporting documents bet buildings, in addition to the physical security probs associated w/ the temporary buildings.

case for new building built around arguemtns of economy and efficiency.

Cong. authorizes [ ] in Mil Construction Act, Sept. 1951--at this time, no site chosen and no plans drawn up. No decisions re these items made and the authorization eventually lapsed.

25X1

July 1, 1955, Iks sends letter to Cong asking for legislation authorization [ ] of which [ ] was to be for actual construction of the building.

25X1  
25X1

PL 84-161 approved on July 15, 1955

*Military Construction Act of 1955 - authorizes construction  
of new HQ*

---



SECRET

consideration given to possibility of using some existing  
building to house CIA.  
But after careful study "PBS (GSA)" recommended a new building  
and suggested in its report of 24 June 1953 that Langley be  
chosen.

p. 381

SECRET

PL 84-161 <sup>authorizes</sup> ~~approves~~ construction of a HQ in the amt. of  million <sup>25X1</sup>  
+ authorized an additional \$8½ million for use in extending the GW  
Plan to the Langley site

PL 84-219 (4 Aug. 55) appropriates \$5½ million for preparation of plans  
+ specifications

PL 84-814 (27 July 56) appropriates the balance authorized in PL 84-161

p. 384

efficiency  
economy  
security

>

the 3 reasons for  
the new HQs

---

SECRET

Pforzheimer Memo for DD/A, 6 June 1952, Subj: CIA Construction, Report No. 9

Chairman Mahon ~~of the Senate Committee on Governmental Operations~~ has advised DCI that it would be inadvisable to proceed w/ construction of new HQ this yr as it might subject CIA to undue publicity and criticism [presumably becuz it was an election yr?]. In view of that recommendation, DCI had determined not to request appropriations fo construction at present time.

---